

1 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
2 United States Attorney
3 CHRISTINA T. SHAY
4 Assistant United States Attorney
5 Chief, Criminal Division
6 ROGER A. HSIEH (Cal. Bar No. 294195)
7 Assistant United States Attorney
8 Deputy Chief, Major Frauds Section
9 1100 United States Courthouse
10 312 North Spring Street
11 Los Angeles, California 90012
12 Telephone: (213) 894-0600
13 Facsimile: (213) 894-6265
14 E-mail: Roger.Hsieh@usdoj.gov

15 NIALL M. O'DONNELL
16 Assistant Chief
17 SIOBHAN M. NAMAZI
18 Trial Attorney
19 United States Department of Justice
20 Criminal Division, Fraud Section
21 300 N. Los Angeles Street, Suite 2001
22 Los Angeles, California 90012
23 Telephone: (202) 257-3295
24 (202) 839-2589
Facsimile: (202) 428-6950
E-mail: Niall.Odonnell@usdoj.gov
Siobhan.Namazi@usdoj.gov

25 Attorneys for Plaintiff
26 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

28 FOR THE CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

29 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

No. 2:25-MJ-3689

30 Plaintiff,

GOVERNMENT'S OPPOSITION TO
DEFENDANT'S APPLICATION FOR
RECONSIDERATION OF COURT'S ORDER
OF DETENTION; EXHIBIT

31 v.

32 PAUL RICHARD RANDALL,

33 Defendant.

34 Plaintiff United States of America, by and through its counsel
35 of record, the United States Attorney for the Central District of
36 California, Assistant United States Attorney Roger A. Hsieh, and

1 Department of Justice Assistant Chief Niall M. O'Donnell and Trial
2 Attorney Siobhan M. Namazi, hereby submits its Memorandum of Points
3 and Authorities in opposition to defendant PAUL RICHARD RANDALL's
4 Application for Reconsideration of the Court's Order of Detention.

5 The government's opposition is based on the Memorandum of Points
6 and Authorities contained herein, the files and records of this case,
7 as well as any other evidence or argument that the Court may wish to
8 consider at the hearing on this request.

9 Dated: July 8, 2025

Respectfully submitted,

10
11 BILAL A. ESSAYLI
United States Attorney

12 CHRISTINA T. SHAY
13 Assistant United States Attorney
Chief, Criminal Division

14 /s/
15

ROGER A. HSIEH
16 Assistant United States Attorney

17 NIALL M. O'DONNELL
18 Assistant Chief
SIOBHAN M. NAMAZI
19 Trial Attorney
Department of Justice

20 Attorneys for Plaintiff
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

Table of Contents

2	MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES.....	1
3	I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
4	III. FACTUAL BACKGROUND.....	2
5	A. Defendant's Prior Criminal Conduct.....	2
6	B. RANDALL Uses Fraud Proceeds to Purchase the Proposed 7 Property in Orange, California as well as Millions of 8 Dollars in Other Assets.....	3
9	C. The Government is Informed Defendant Would Return to 10 White Memorial Hospital and Then a Facility in 11 Pacoima, California if Discharged.....	5
12	III. ARGUMENT.....	5
13	A. The Court Properly Held That the Government Was 14 Entitled to A Detention Hearing.....	5
15	B. The Proposed Additional \$40,000 Unsecured Bond and 16 Additional Medical Information Do Not Mitigate 17 Defendant's Significant Danger to the Community.....	8
18	C. Defendant Has Failed to Make a Due Process Claim, and 19 He Should Not Be Released Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i).....	9
20	IV. CONCLUSION.....	10

1 **MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES**

2 **I. INTRODUCTION**

3 After sustaining at least five convictions for fraud, serving
4 four different custodial sentences, and while awaiting trial for tax
5 evasion related to another health care fraud kickback scheme,
6 defendant PAUL RICHARD RANDALL ("defendant" or "RANDALL") engaged in
7 a brazen \$270 million Medi-Cal fraud and kickback scheme. At his
8 initial appearance, RANDALL argued for release on a \$100,000
9 unsecured bond signed by his son and then proposed putting up
10 property in Orange, California, as a secured bond. The Court
11 properly detained RANDALL based on the significant danger he poses to
12 community.

13 RANDALL now moves for reconsideration by proposing an additional
14 \$40,000 unsecured bond and points to medical conditions. RANDALL
15 proposes using the same property that he offered at his initial
16 appearance: property purchased with funds from RANDALL's current \$270
17 million Medi-Cal fraud scheme and put in the name of SoCal Trust, the
18 same entity RANDALL used to launder the proceeds of his -- at least -
19 - third consecutive health care fraud scheme. The additional
20 proposed \$40,000 unsecured bond does nothing to mitigate RANDALL's
21 significant danger to the community. His citation to additional
22 medical conditions also does not mitigate his danger to the community
23 -- financial crimes that he can easily commit through others as he
24 has done in the past with a telephone or computer. RANDALL also
25 fails to provide new evidence that overcomes the Court's finding that
26 the government met the low threshold to entitle it to a detention
27 hearing. RANDALL has not met his burden of raising new information
28 that was not previously considered by this Court warranting release

1 for a serial offender, and the Court should deny his motion for
 2 reconsideration.

3 **II. FACTUAL BACKGROUND**

4 **A. Defendant's Prior Criminal Conduct**

5 The government described RANDALL's significant criminal history
 6 spanning more than three decades in its motion for detention filed on
 7 June 27, 2025, and reattaches its motion here. (See Exhibit 1.)

8 In 2012, RANDALL was convicted of his first fraud and kickback
 9 scheme in this District based on his paying kickbacks to
 10 chiropractors and physicians to refer workers' compensation patients
 11 for spinal surgeries and on his creating invoices falsely inflating
 12 the cost of spinal surgery hardware to be used in the surgeries,
 13 which were then billed to the workers' compensation insurance
 14 carriers. See United States v. Paul Randall, 8:12-cr-0023-JLS, Dkt.

15 4. RANDALL pleaded guilty to conspiracy to commit mail fraud, in
 16 violation of 18 U.S.C. § 371. Id. His conduct was part of the
 17 larger Pacific Hospital kickback scheme, which billed nearly \$580
 18 million over eight years, about \$72.5 million a year. See
 19 [https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/five-people-including-two-](https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/five-people-including-two-doctors-charged-kickback-schemes-involving-nearly-600-million)
 20 [doctors-charged-kickback-schemes-involving-nearly-600-million](https://www.justice.gov/usao-cdca/pr/five-people-including-two-doctors-charged-kickback-schemes-involving-nearly-600-million).

21 While on supervised release for his 2012 conviction, RANDALL
 22 committed tax fraud in this District through a prescription referral
 23 business and was later charged with three counts of tax evasion.
 24 United States v. Paul Randall, 2:20-cr-0031. Specifically,
 25 defendant, while on release for his prior conviction and despite his
 26 prior conviction for mail fraud conspiracy, defendant agreed to refer
 27 patients to providers in exchange for providers' writing
 28 prescriptions for "expensive and medically unnecessary compound

1 drugs" reimbursed by health insurers. Id., Dkt. 37. RANDALL then
2 agreed that he would be paid 50% of net reimbursements to the
3 pharmacy paid by insurers for the prescriptions RANDALL obtained for
4 them. Id. RANDALL then had the pharmacy write the kickback checks
5 payable to persons RANDALL specified -- including one of RANDALL's
6 lawyers in the Pacific Hospital case -- without those individuals'
7 knowledge; RANDALL then cashed the checks, forging the individuals'
8 signatures, and avoided reporting on that income. Id. RANDALL was
9 then pleaded guilty to one count of tax evasion in violation of 26
10 U.S.C. § 7201, and was sentenced to 23 months in custody. Id., Dkt.
11 84.

12 Despite having had his bail revoked in 2017 for violating his
13 release conditions while awaiting sentencing in a health care
14 kickback case and a separate indictment returned in 2020 for tax
15 evasion from a separate health care fraud and kickback scheme,
16 RANDALL again flouted the terms of his release by engaging in the
17 instant conduct. Around the time RANDALL pleaded guilty in April
18 2022 for his tax evasion related to his second health care fraud and
19 kickback scheme, he engaged in a \$270 million scheme to defraud Medi-
20 Cal from May 2022 through April 2023 as detailed in the complaint
21 affidavit.

22 **B. RANDALL Uses Fraud Proceeds to Purchase the Proposed**
23 **Property in Orange, California as well as Millions of**
24 **Dollars in Other Assets**

25 RANDALL used fraudulent proceeds to acquire the property on E.
26 Grovewood in Orange, California, at auction in September 2023,
27 through SoCal Trust and using approximately \$3.4 million in funds
28 associated with the Medi-Cal fraud proceeds. The trustee listed on

1 the property through SoCal Trust was K.J., the same individual as
2 alleged in the affidavit that was used to launder the fraud proceeds
3 at defendant's direction.

4 The same attorney that RANDALL used in the fraud scheme as
5 alleged in the affidavit then setup another entity, Frample Family
6 LLC. The deed to the property was then transferred from SoCal Trust
7 to Frample Family LLC. RANDALL now proposes a surety by Mark
8 Randall. In October 2023, Mark Randall opened a bank account in the
9 name of Frample Family LLC at Wells Fargo Bank. Further, RANDALL's
10 phone at the time of his most recent arrest was also in the name of
11 Mark Randall. At the time that the government executed a search
12 warrant at the E. Grovewood property in November 2023, RANDALL's
13 vehicle, a 2018 black Tesla with license plate 8VFE450, which
14 defendant was captured on surveillance driving on several occasions,
15 was registered under the name of Mark Randall. During execution of
16 the search warrant at the E. Grovewood property, law enforcement
17 recovered from the Tesla evidence of the Medi-Cal fraud scheme, as
18 well as access devices under the name of "Richard P. Randall" and K.
19 J.¹

20 RANDALL also used the Medi-Cal fraud proceeds to purchase
21 millions of dollars in other assets², including the following:
22
23

24 ¹ Per the terms of his supervised release conditions, RANDALL
25 was prohibited from possessing access devices in another individual's
name.

26 ² As the government noted at the last bond hearing, it reserves
27 the right to request a Nebbia hearing as to any assets offered by
28 RANDALL in support of a bond package.

- 1 • 2020 Mercedes AMG purchased with more than \$100,000 in
2 fraud proceeds from a SoCal Trust account and titled in
3 Mark Randall's name
- 4 • Seven real properties purchased using Medi-Cal fraud scheme
5 proceeds valued at more than \$10 million
- 6 • \$1.8 million in sports memorabilia purchased using Medi-Cal
7 fraud proceeds

8 Notably, defendant did not report any of the above assets to
9 Probation as reflected in the Pretrial Services Report dated June 27,
10 2025.

11 In March and April of 2024, one of the SoCal Trust accounts used
12 to effectuate the Medi-Cal fraud effectuated large transactions to
13 Frample Family LLC.

14 **C. The Government is Informed Defendant Would Return to White**
15 **Memorial Hospital and Then a Facility in Pacoima,**
16 **California if Discharged**

17 On July 8, 2025, the government contacted the U.S. Marshals
18 Service, Court Operations, who informed them that if detained,
19 defendant would initially return to White Memorial Hospital, and if
20 defendant is discharged from White Memorial Hospital, that defendant
21 would be admitted to United Health, a skilled nursing facility in
22 Pacoima, California. Pacoima, California is within the Central
23 District of California.

24 **III. ARGUMENT**

25 **A. The Court Properly Held That the Government Was Entitled to**
26 **A Detention Hearing**

27 The Court rejected RANDALL's argument at his initial appearance
28 that the government was not entitled to a detention hearing.

1 Although RANDALL argues that he proposes new information to trigger a
 2 hearing -- the additional \$40,000 unsecured bond and additional
 3 medical information -- he does not propose new information as to why
 4 the government is not entitled to a detention hearing. Instead,
 5 defendant cites several cases in addressing risk of flight as to
 6 detention, not as to the threshold question as to whether the
 7 government is entitled to a detention hearing.

8 Indeed, the Court correctly found that the government was
 9 entitled to a detention hearing and RANDALL offers no new basis for
 10 reconsideration. Section 3142(f) mandates that a "judicial officer
 11 shall hold a [detention] hearing . . . upon motion of the attorney
 12 for the Government" or, in addition to the cases under (f)(2), "upon
 13 the judicial officer's own motion." § 3142(f)(2) (emphasis added).
 14 The use of the word "shall" implies a mandatory act, "which normally
 15 creates an obligation impervious to judicial discretion." Lexecon
 16 Inc. v. Milberg Weiss Bershad Hynes & Lerach, 523 U.S. 26, 27 (1998).
 17 In other words, the statute's use of the word "shall" requires that
 18 the judicial officer hold the detention hearing upon motion of the
 19 government without regard to any particular burden of proof. Given
 20 that "[t]he decision whether to hold a hearing occurs based on even
 21 less information than a decision to detain or release," it follows
 22 that the standard to invoke the detention hearing should be much
 23 lower. United States v. Singleton, 182 F.3d 7, 12 (D.C. Cir. 1999).
 24 "[A] detention order is based on a hearing, while an order to hold a
 25 hearing is based on a proffer of what the hearing might establish."
 26 Id.

27 "[T]he government or Court need only express their belief" that
 28 a valid ground under § 3142(f) exists for a detention hearing.

1 United States v. White, 2018 WL 5291989, at *4 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 19,
2 2018); see also United States v. Powers, 318 F. Supp. 2d 339, 341
3 (W.D. Va. 2004) (explaining that the standard to trigger a detention
4 hearing occurs when the "United States or the court believes there is
5 a serious risk of flight").

6 As the government argued in its previous brief and at the
7 initial appearance, there is a serious risk that RANDALL will flee.
8 Despite a significant criminal history, it appears that RANDALL has
9 not been sentenced to more than 36 months in custody. Here, he faces
10 significant prison time, including a decade or more for committing
11 the instant crime while on pre-trial release. See 18 U.S.C. § 3147.

12 The likelihood of a significant sentence provides RANDALL an
13 incentive to flee. See United States v. Townsend, 897 F.2d 989, 995
14 (9th Cir. 1990) ("[c]onsideration of the nature of the offenses
15 charged involves consideration of the penalties"); United States v.
16 Possino, No. CR 13-00048, 2013 WL 1415108, at *4 (C.D. Cal. Apr. 8,
17 2013) ("The weight of the evidence against [defendant] is strong.
18 Defendant's awareness of a potentially lengthy prison sentence and
19 the perception of a likely conviction constitute powerful motivations
20 to flee."). These factors weigh towards defendant's detention. See
21 United States v. Al-Arian, 280 F. Supp. 2d 1345, 1358 (M.D. Fla.
22 2003) ("the stronger the government's case, especially if the
23 sentence will be severe, the greater a defendant's incentive to
24 flee"). RANDALL has also unverified and unreported financial
25 resources, including millions of dollars in assets purchased using
26 fraud scheme proceeds, that provide additional evidence that he is a
27 serious risk of flight. RANDALL has not provided any new evidence
28 that the government is not entitled to a detention hearing.

1 **B. The Proposed Additional \$40,000 Unsecured Bond and**
2 **Additional Medical Information Do Not Mitigate Defendant's**
3 **Significant Danger to the Community**

4 The additional \$40,000 unsecured bond proposed by RANDALL does
5 nothing to mitigate his significant danger to the community. See
6 United States v. Rodriguez, 950 F.2d 85, 89 (2d Cir. 1991) (noting a
7 "security bond, cosigned by two financially responsible persons,
8 strict pretrial service agency supervision and restriction of travel"
9 and the "existence of four cosigners and \$10,000 cash may assure the
10 appearance of [Defendant] at trial but will not secure the safety of
11 the community") (emphasis added). Even if confined to his home,
12 RANDALL could still perpetrate his fraud schemes with the use of a
13 telephone or computer as evidenced by his prior fraud schemes.
14 Moreover, as alleged in the complaint, RANDALL's modus operandi is to
15 effectuate his criminal conduct through other individuals, including
16 K.J. and his attorney. None of the accounts involved in the Medi-Cal
17 fraud scheme or assets purchased using fraud scheme proceeds are
18 under RANDALL's name. Confining RANDALL to his home would do nothing
19 to deter RANDALL from continuing to perpetrate crimes through other
20 individuals.

21 The additional medical information also does not mitigate his
22 danger to the community. See, e.g., United States v. Marino, 731 F.
23 Supp. 2d 323, 327 (S.D.N.Y. 2010) (denying release pending trial for
24 69-year-old defendant with likely atherosclerosis, mild stroke,
25 cardiac rhythm problem, transient ischemic attach, and risk of stroke
due to danger and noting BOP is responsive to defendant's situation).
27 RANDALL's current physical condition does not provide an independent
28 basis to release him. To the contrary, on June 26, 2025, the date of

1 his arrest, agents observed RANDALL walk into the U.S. Probation
2 Office without any assistance from another individual or from a cane,
3 wheelchair, or other ambulatory device. In addition, the week prior
4 to RANDALL's arrest in June 2025, law enforcement observed RANDALL
5 driving his vehicle out of his residence. Even if RANDALL was
6 bedbound, he could continue to carry out massive fraud schemes.

7 **C. Defendant Has Failed to Make a Due Process Claim, and He**
8 **Should Not Be Released Under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)**

9 The right to counsel is not absolute. The Supreme Court has
10 recognized that the "core purpose" of the counsel guarantee is to
11 assure aid at trial, "when the accused [is] confronted with both the
12 intricacies of the law and the advocacy of the public prosecutor."
13 United States v. Gouveia, 467 U.S. 180, 188, (1984).

14 Here, RANDALL's due process arguments are premature. It
15 appears that RANDALL has not yet been assigned a detention facility
16 for the pendency of this case. Once RANDALL is assigned a facility
17 pending trial, the BOP will provide him access to counsel. After
18 that time, RANDALL can, if needed, raise potential concerns with the
19 BOP, and if needed, the District Judge and government regarding the
20 trial schedule. Further, as noted above, the U.S. Marshals Service,
21 Court Operations, informed the government on July 8, 2025, that if
22 detained, defendant would initially return to White Memorial
23 Hospital, and if defendant is discharged from White Memorial
24 Hospital, that defendant would be admitted to United Health, a
25 skilled nursing facility in Pacoima, California.

26 RANDALL's arraignment is not until July 17, 2025, and there is
27 no trial date yet. Any temporary release under 18 U.S.C. § 3142(i)
28 would be premature, and RANDALL cannot show that release is necessary

1 for preparation of his defense or that the BOP cannot accommodate any
2 of his medical conditions.

3 **IV. CONCLUSION**

4 RANDALL's proposal of an additional \$40,000 unsecured bond is
5 woefully insufficient to mitigate his risk of flight and demonstrated
6 danger to the community while on pretrial release. Because RANDALL
7 has failed to meet his burden on his motion for reconsideration, the
8 government respectfully requests that the Court deny defendant's
9 motion.

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28